



CITY OF SUNNYVALE

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

June 17, 2003

TO: Robert LaSala, City Manager

FROM: Mary Bradley, Director of Finance

SUBJECT: Review of FY 2001/2002 Performance Results for Program 453 – Animal Control

Attached for your review is the final audit report for the recently completed review of performance measures and activities for the Animal Control Program, Program 453. Pablo Federico and Cheryl Waldrip prepared the report, and it was reviewed by the Department of Public Safety, which has agreed with all but two of the audit team's recommendations. A summary of all recommendations is included as part of the Department's response at the end of the report.

The audit included:

- Testing of procedures outlined within each Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) to determine whether the procedures are clearly stated and understood by staff and whether they can be followed as described;
- Testing of performance values reported for FY 2001/2002 to ensure mathematical accuracy and to determine whether adequate documentation exists to support the reported results; and,
- Evaluation of whether the existing measures coordinate with the current efforts undertaken by the program.

It is recommended that this audit report be utilized as a resource in the pending restructure process.

I'd like to take this opportunity to commend Public Safety staff, and in particular Capt. Kirk Sanfilippo, Capt. Greg Kevin and Sr. CSO Michelle Morgan, for their cooperation and assistance with the audit.

Program Audit Results

Animal *Control*

June 2003

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Background	5
Summary of Findings	5
Audit Findings and Recommendations.....	7

Section I

<i>Program Measure Findings and Recommendations</i>	<i>7</i>
Measure #1	7
Measure #2	8
Measure #3	9
Measure #4	10
Measure #5	10
Measure #6	12
Measure #7	12

Section II

<i>Service Delivery Plan Measure Findings and Recommendations.....</i>	<i>13</i>
--	-----------

<i>A. SDP 45301 – Animal Control Response.....</i>	<i>13</i>
--	-----------

SDP 01 Measure #1	13
SDP 01 Measure #2	13
SDP 01 Measure #3	14
SDP 01 Measure #4	14

<i>B. SDP 45302 – Animal Control Education and Enforcement.....</i>	<i>14</i>
---	-----------

SDP 02 Measure #1	14
SDP 02 Measure #2	15
SDP 02 Measure #3	16
SDP 02 Measure #4	17
SDP 02 Measure #5	17
SDP 02 Measure #6	18

Section III

<i>Activity Findings and Recommendations.....</i>	<i>18</i>
---	-----------

Activity 453000	18
Activity 453010	18
Activity 453020	19
Activity 453120	19
Activity 453130	19
Activity 453140.....	19

Activity 453150.....	20
Conclusion.....	20
Department Response.....	21

Introduction

The performance review of the Animal Control program commenced in late 2002 and was carried out as part of the effort to audit all City programs over the course of several years. This review was conducted in conjunction with the review of two other Public Safety programs: Emergency Preparedness and Police Services. A review of the Fire Services program commenced in early 2003. The fifth and final Public Safety program, Administrative and Technical Services, is slated for future review.

The FY 2002/2003 budget provides \$710,200 and 6,364 work hours for achievement of the Animal Control program goals. This represents less than 2% of the total Public Safety budget of \$47.9 million. This budget includes the cost of animal shelter which was about \$398,000.

During the audit, the audit team was greatly assisted by Capt. Kirk Sanfilippo, Capt. Greg Kevin, and Sr. CSO Michelle Morgan. Their full cooperation facilitated the audit process.

Scope and Methodology

The purpose of the performance audit of the Animal Control Program was to review and verify the FY 2001/2002 results of the program, SDP, and activity measures. Audit staff gathered and reviewed all written procedures (SOPs) for calculating the program's outcome measures and activities. The audit staff then evaluated the methodology employed for reporting results for FY 2001/2002, as well as the documentation used for those calculations and the mathematical accuracy of the reported figures. Although some findings and recommendations touch on the program's organization, operations, efficiency or efficacy, these elements were not the focus of the review. Some findings and recommendations relate to the merits of the measures themselves but this was also not the focus of the review.

The review of the program's results and measures uncovered major issues with the program's core mission and objectives. The audit team has commented where appropriate on the incongruity between the measures, the actual efforts undertaken by staff, and the program's core mission and objectives. The approach of the audit was a bottom-up approach in that the audit team analyzed the actual efforts of staff, then the results reported for the measures, followed by the measures themselves, and ending with the program's overall mission and objectives. The focus of the review, however, was on the actual results reported and not on the overall intent of the measures or on the core mission and objectives.

Background

The Animal Control Program Outcome Statement lists the following goals and ways of achieving those outcomes:

Controlling animal disease and vicious animals, minimizing animal nuisances, and promoting the humane treatment of animals by:

- emergency animal control services,
- domestic animal control services,
- non-domestic animal control services,
- animal licensing services, and
- community animal control education and enforcement.

There are 26 total measures/activities in this program, some of which duplicate each other. The audit team audited 24 of those measures as one of those measures is new and therefore no results were reported for it in FY 2001/2002. The other measure was an allocated cost measure and was not reviewed.

Summary of Findings

1. *Staff has not adequately documented the FY 2001/2002 year-end results reported for this program.*

While the lack of documentation does not mean that the reported results were not in fact achieved, it exposes the management to questions of credibility that generally could have been averted by better record keeping. The audit team received inadequate documentation from staff for 46% (11/24) of the reported measures. Inadequate documentation was provided in support of the results reported for:

- Program Measures # 2, 3, and 5
 - SDP 45301 Measures #2, 3, and 4,
 - SDP 45302 Measure #1 and 6
 - Activity 453000, 453010, and 453130
2. *Results were incorrectly reported for 25% (6/24) of the measures either because SOPs were not followed or calculations were materially in error. This finding applies to the following measures:*
 - Program Measures #5 and 6
 - SDP 45302 Measure #3, and 6
 - Activity 453140 and 453150
 3. *Some measures could not be calculated accurately and as a result only broad estimates were reported. This finding applies to the following measures:*

- Program Measure #2
- SDP 45301 #2, 3, and 4

4. *Many SOPs are confusing, vague and/or contain incorrect calculation methodologies.*

The audit team concluded that all SOPs need revision because they are either out of date, confusing and vague or incorrect.

5. *Some measures are inconsistent with the actual efforts undertaken by this program.*

The program outcome statement is listed as “controlling animal disease and vicious animals, minimizing animal nuisances, and promoting the humane treatment of animals by:

- emergency animal control services,
- domestic animal control services,
- non-domestic animal control services,
- animal licensing services, and
- community animal control education and enforcement.”

Despite the outcome statement, animal control staff does not provide emergency animal control services. For instance, Program Measure # 1 gauges response times to urgent animal calls. However if an animal is affecting public safety, patrol units, not Animal Control units, are dispatched to the scene. Moreover, Animal Control units are not equipped to respond to animal calls with lights and sirens. It is problematic to expect Animal Control to respond to emergency animal calls.

The outcome statement and some measures distinguish between domestic and non-domestic animal control services. The actual efforts undertaken by animal control staff, however, make no distinction between domestic and non-domestic services.

6. *Some measures must be eliminated or substantially revised in order for accurate results to be reported. This finding applies to the following measures:*

- Program Measure #1, 2, 3, and 5
- SDP 41201 #1, 2, 3, and 4
- SDP 41202 #1
- Activity 453000 and 453130

These measures cannot be calculated because of the wording of the measure and/or because Animal Control staff has no way of tracking the result. This appears to be the most worrisome finding associated with the results reported for this program in FY 2001/2002. The audit team has made some short-term recommendations about revising these measures. In the long-term, the audit team recommends that the program’s core mission and objectives be re-evaluated and that a new set of measures that are reflective of the revised core mission and objectives be developed.

Audit Findings and Recommendations

Section I: Program Measure Findings and Recommendations Animal Control Program

Program Measure #1.

Urgent animal calls are responded to with an average response time of seven minutes (from time received by dispatch.)

Finding #1: The analysis staff used to arrive at the reported result of N/A was not well documented. In FY 2001/2002, Police Field Operations responded to 73 animal calls that were initially dispatched as vicious (urgent) calls. However, staff reviewed all 73 calls and found that only seven calls qualified as vicious calls. Captain Sanfilippo then reviewed all seven case files and none truly fit the definition of a vicious call per the SOP. The SOP for this measure defines a vicious call as an emergency call where an animal is endangering public health or safety. No urgent vicious calls were therefore recorded last year. As a result, an average response time could not be calculated in FY 2001/2002. No back-up documentation was provided for any of the initial 73 calls thought to be vicious animal calls.

Finding #2: The measure cannot be calculated. The SOP for this measure defines a vicious call as an emergency call where an animal is endangering public health or safety. As the response priorities currently stand for Public Safety, any such emergency call would require a patrol response and not an animal control unit response because animal control units are not equipped with lights and sirens. Animal Control staff should therefore not be expected to respond to such calls in less than seven minutes. Furthermore, Animal Control staff is not on-call 24 hours. Any response time to animal emergencies should therefore be a measure of police patrol units and not Animal Control staff.

Finding #3: The SOP conflicts with the measure itself. The SOP defines the calls that count toward this measure as "Emergency" calls, which otherwise require a 4-minute response, and yet the measure is for "Urgent" calls (a 7-minute response and a different call type.)

Finding #4: Although the mission of the program includes responding to emergency situations, it's clear that Animal Control is not actually providing emergency animal services. The program needs to re-evaluate the mission in light of the services actually provided.

Recommendation: Eliminate the measure.

Program Measure #2.

Nuisance animal calls for service are responded to or referred to appropriate agencies within one day 95% of the time.

According to Animal Control staff, they responded to 1,591 nuisance calls in FY 01/02, all within 24 hours of the call. Animal Control staff does not track nuisance animal calls that are referred elsewhere. As a result, Animal Control staff does not know how many calls were referred to other agencies and within what time frame these calls were referred. There is no documentation for the 100% result reported. Animal Control claims that as a matter of policy, they respond or refer calls to appropriate agencies within one day 100% of the time. Animal Control could not compute this percentage and therefore estimated 100% to reflect their policy.

Finding #1: The analysis staff used to arrive at the reported result was not documented. According to Animal Control staff, there is no documentation available for the 100% reported or the 1,591 nuisance calls. The audit team could not substantiate the result reported.

Finding #2: The calculation method detailed in the SOP is vague and unclear. The SOP states that nuisance calls are “those that do not pose an immediate threat to public health or safety, and do not require an immediate response by an Animal Control Officer.” Despite the SOP definition of what constitutes “Nuisance Animal Calls,” there is much confusion as to what type of calls should be classified as a nuisance calls. Specifically, it remains unclear which police incident codes should be considered when determining the total number of “Nuisance calls.” For example, nuisance animal calls may include noisy animal calls (1091B), confined animal calls (1091C), injured or sick animal calls (1091I), or even stray animal calls (1091S). The SOP is unclear as to what call incident types should count as “nuisance” calls.

Finding #3: Tracking whether or not a nuisance call for service is responded to or referred (within a day) is not possible under the current tracking system. In theory, under the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, all incoming nuisance animal calls can be tracked. However, calls coming directly to Animal Control, whether referred elsewhere or not, are not tracked by the CAD system. In addition, there is no tracking of calls that are in the CAD system to determine whether they are addressed or referred. The 100% reported calls are a reflection of what Animal Control believes occurs. However, if calls for service were not responded to within a day, there would be no way to track this occurrence. Take for example the following scenario: A nuisance call comes in after-hours meaning that Animal Control is not around to respond. The dispatcher opens and closes the case and sends it over to the Animal Control office. The following day, the call is not forwarded to Animal Control (for whatever reason.) Through no fault of their own, they would have failed to respond to or refer the nuisance call. This occurrence, however, would go unrecorded, and Animal Control would report 100% for the measure. Without a formal mechanism to track all Animal Control calls and how long it takes to respond or refer those calls, calculating response to nuisance calls cannot be done accurately.

Recommendation: In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure entirely and develop a measure that is closely related to the program's core mission and objectives. A second and short-term alternative is to change the measure to read as follows: "Non-Emergency calls (including nuisance calls) that are dispatched to animal control are responded to within an average of 10 hours." Notice that this alternative would make the measure similar to the recommended measure in SDP 45301 #2.

Program Measure #3.

The number of vaccinated and licensed animals increases two and one-half percent annually from the FY 1997/1998 base year level.

Animal Control Staff ran a query on Crystal Reports and found 3,925 licensed animals in their database in FY 2001/2002. They compared this number to the number reported in FY 2000/2001 of 4,046 and concluded that the number of vaccinated and licensed animals decreased 2.99%. Staff was unable to replicate this number when they ran the report for the audit team. Every time the report was refreshed, it gave a different number.

Finding #1: The reported result for FY 2001/2002 was not properly documented. The Crystal Reports system was unable to replicate the number of licensed animals reported. Moreover, the number of licensed animals on the database is not frequently purged. Many of the licensed animals in the database may have died or moved away but are still counted in the database. The audit team could not substantiate the number reported.

Finding #2: Animal Control staff has no accurate way to keep the number of licensed animals current in the database. Some licenses last longer than a year and that distorts the number of licensed animals in the database. The database used to track the number of licensed animals is unreliable and Animal Control staff cannot replicate the same number once the database is refreshed.

Finding #3: The measure might contradict program efforts. Specifically, an increase in animal licenses may reflect an increase in the animal population. An increase in the animal population might run contrary to the efforts undertaken by Animal Control to curb the Animal population growth by community animal control education (SDP 45302.) For example, Animal Control educates the public on the benefits of spaying and neutering pets. Increasing the amount of animal licenses might therefore run contrary to the goal of bringing the animal population down.

Finding #4: The measure is bound to be unattainable after a few years. As the target performance increases by 2.5% every year, eventually the target will become too large to meet.

Recommendation: In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure and develop a new measure that is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives. In the short-term, the measure may be revised so that it only targets the amount of animal licenses processed. Animal Control staff already tracks it on an accounting period basis

on the “Animal Control Unit Statistic Sheet.” The measure should read similar to the following: “The number of new and current animal licenses processed remains at or above the previous year level”.

Program Measure #4.

The Budget/Cost Ratio (planned cost divided by actual cost) is at 1.0.

In FY 2001/2002, staff used the Period 14 Management by Objective (MBO) report and divided the program budget of \$650,010.52 by the total expenditure of \$660,465.87 for a result of .984. Due to a typo, the result reported incorrectly shows 98.4.

Findings: None.

Recommendation: None.

Program Measure #5.

The number of animal control calls for dog bites from stray animals is reduced five percent annually from the base year level.

In FY 2001/2002, Animal Control staff reported that there were 15 total calls for dog bites in FY 2001/2002 and 14 calls for dog bites in FY 2000/2001. The Animal Bite Report Log had a total of 68 dog bites in FY 2001/2002. Of those 68 bites, 15 were listed as being from stray dogs. Only 5 of those 15 calls were bites from strays without owners. Animal Control staff, however, used the number 15 to calculate the measure because at the time of the calculation it was unclear whether or not to include bites from strays with owners. Animal Control staff compared the 15 calls in FY 2001/2002 to the previous year total of 14 calls and determined that the percentage reduction was 6.67% ($1 - (14/15) = .0667$.) The -6.67% was rounded to -7%.

Finding #1: The 14 calls for bites from FY 2000/2001 have no back-up documentation. As a result, the audit team could not substantiate the result reported for this measure.

Finding #2: The SOP for this measure is vague and does not contain instructions on how to calculate the measure. It states that the CAD system maintains records of all animal calls for service. The CAD system, however, does not distinguish bites by animal type and is incapable of separating out the number of animal control calls for dog bites from stray animals. As a result, the FY 2001/2002 number of calls came from a manual log kept by Animal Control staff.

Finding #3: The wording of the measure and the actual number reported are two different results and are incongruent. The measure states that the number of calls should be reduced five percent annually from the base year level (1997.) However, neither the SOP nor the Animal Control staff knew how many calls for dog bites were received in 1997. The measure, as it is currently calculated, compares the calls for dog bites of the current fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

Finding #4: There is some confusion as to what should be counted in calculating the measure. The measure as it is worded gauges the number of calls for bites as opposed to the actual number of bites. There is some confusion as to whether the number reported should reflect the number of calls or the number of bites. For example, a stray dog might bite several people at a park. One person might call Animal Control and report that a stray dog is biting people in the park. Should the number reported reflect only the one call, the one stray dog or the number of people bitten? The answer remains unclear.

Finding #5: Assuming the measure is calculated as a comparison to the prior year rather than the base year, the measure is mathematically obtuse. To illustrate the reasons why it is a problematic measure, consider the following two scenarios.

$$\% \text{ change} = \left(\frac{\text{current year}}{\text{previous year}} \right) - 1$$

Scenario 1. We are in FY 2004/2005. No dog bites from stray animals have occurred in the City of Sunnyvale. In the previous year (FY 2003/2004) there were 7 bites from stray animals. The result reported for the measure in FY 2004/2005 has to be -100%. Regardless of how many bites were in the previous year (FY 2003/2004), the result reported for the measure will always be -100%.

$$\% \text{ change} = (0/7) - 1 = -100\%$$

Scenario 2. We are in FY 2004/2005. No dog bites from stray animals have occurred in the City of Sunnyvale. The following year (FY 2005/2006), there are 5 dog bites from stray animals. The result that should be reported for the measure in FY 2005/2006 is not calculable. Regardless of how many bites were in the following year (FY 2005/2006), the result reported for the measure will never be calculable.

$$\% \text{ change} = (5/0) - 1 = \text{Not A Number}$$

Finding #6: The purpose of this measure is unclear and the measure itself is not properly linked to the overall objectives and mission of the Animal Control Program. Measuring the number of calls for dog bites is not directly proportional to Animal Control staff efforts. An increase in the number of calls for dog bites can be attributed to several factors such as a larger dog population, a dog that bites multiple people, or increased awareness of who to call to report dog bites. Regardless of what causes the number of calls for dog bites to increase or decrease, a decrease in calls does not necessarily equate to better program performance. While better program performance might contribute to a decrease in calls for dog bites, the measure assumes that the Animal Control Program can shape the total number of calls for dog bites solely by its performance.

Recommendation: In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure and develop a new measure that is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives. As a short-term solution, staff can measure the number of bites from stray animals and report

that number. The new measure would require a new SOP with a new calculation method and a specific definition of what constitutes a “stray” animal. This type of measure can be manually tracked and is in fact already tracked on an animal bite log sheet. The result reported for this measure should be consistent with the number that is reported to the County of Santa Clara Public Health Department.

Program Measure #6.

All animal establishments are inspected and permitted annually to assure that animals are treated humanely and disease prevention measures are in place as required by law.

Each time an animal establishment is inspected, an Animal Establishment Inspection Report checklist is filed. If the report shows any violations, the establishment must be reinspected and it must correct those violations. According to Note #6 in the Performance Outcomes Agreement Process: Reporting Phase, all three existing establishments were inspected. Animal Control staff later sent an e-mail to the audit team stating that there were actually 6 inspections conducted in FY 2001/2002. After looking at all the Animal Establishment Inspection Reports that were provided by Animal Control staff, the audit team determined that only five establishments were inspected in the 2001/2002 fiscal year. The sixth establishment, (Canine Showcase) was inspected during the 2002/2003 fiscal year. Animal Control assumed that these six establishments were the only animal establishments in the city of Sunnyvale and therefore reported 100%. The correct number reported, based on the information provided to the audit team, should have been 83% (5/6).

Finding: Animal Control staff might be unaware of existing animal establishments. As a result, Animal Control might not inspect all establishments and still report 100%. Animal Control lacks a reliable way of finding the total number of operating animal establishments.

Recommendation: Animal Control staff should devise a reliable way to find the total number of businesses that deal with animals as a primary business function. In doing so, they should remain aware of the parameters established by the SOP as to what constitutes an “inspectable” animal establishment. A possible method of retrieving the total number of animal establishments may be the Business License Tax System from the Finance Department. Staff should determine how to extract the wanted information from the system and include the instructions in the SOP.

Program Measure #7.

A satisfaction rating of 85% is achieved for Animal Control Services.

Using summary data from the June 2002 and December 2001 Citywide surveys conducted by the Gelfond Group, staff added together the “favorable” ratings for the question “How would you rate the City of Sunnyvale on each of the following services? Animal Control.” The possible answers were Very good, good, average, poor, or very poor. The summary results provided by the Gelfond Group converted these results into

“Favorable, neutral, or below average.” Public Safety summed the “favorable” results from the June 2002 survey (70%) to the “favorable” results from the December 2001 survey (70%) and divided by 2 for the average rating of 70%. This measure was computed correctly.

Finding: The SOP does not give accurate instructions for calculating the measure.

Recommendation: Edit the SOP so that it contains an accurate and specific calculation method.

Section II: Service Delivery Plan Measure Findings and Recommendations

A. SDP 45301 - Animal Control Response

SDP 01 Measure #1.

Urgent calls for service for vicious or injured animals affecting Public Safety are responded to with an average response time of seven minutes (from time received by dispatch) achieved.

All findings regarding program measure #1 also apply to this measure. In addition, the following finding applies:

Finding: Urgent calls for service for vicious animals and calls for service for injured animals have different response priorities. Animal Control units are not the primary respondents to urgent/vicious calls for service where an animal is endangering public safety. These calls are dispatched to police patrol units. Animal Control units, however, do handle injured animal calls. The two types of calls have different response priorities. Combining these two types of calls makes the result impossible to calculate.

Recommendation: Eliminate the measure. In the long-run, staff should consider if measuring response times to injured animal calls is consistent with the program’s core mission and objectives.

SDP 01 Measure #2.

Non-Emergency calls for domestic animal control services are responded to within an average of one day.

Animal Control staff stated that as a matter of policy they respond to all animal calls (domestic or non-domestic) within one day. No documentation was provided for the average one-day reported. Animal Control staff also stated that the measure was not very meaningful since average response time should not be reported in days but hours. Even if the measure reported hours, there would be no way to track it because no distinction is made between domestic and non-domestic animal calls.

Finding #1: The audit team could not substantiate the one-day result reported.

Finding #2: A response time for this measure cannot be calculated. The SOP developed in 1997 states that case numbers are generated by dispatch for non-emergency calls for domestic animal control services. This SOP is inaccurate because the CAD system has no way of distinguishing between domestic and non-domestic animal calls.

Finding #3: There is no operational reason for distinguishing between domestic and non-domestic calls. Animal Control staff did not know why the distinction was ever made.

Recommendation: Revise the measure by eliminating the distinction between domestic and non-domestic. The measure would read as follows: "Non-Emergency calls for animal control services are responded to within an average of 10 hours." This alternate measure can actually be calculated and was developed with the assistance of Animal Control staff. Animal Control staff believes that an average 10 hour response time target is a more realistic goal for measuring Animal Control performance. The measure would require a new SOP with a new calculation method and an explanation describing how to account for after-hours calls.

SDP 01 – Measure #3

Non-Emergency calls for NON-domestic animal control services are responded to within an average of one day.

See findings and recommendations regarding SDP 01 Measure #2. This measure would be deleted.

SDP – 01 Measure #4.

Nuisance non-domestic animal control referrals or services are provided 95% of the time.

See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #2. This measure would be deleted.

B. SDP 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement

SDP 02 – Measure #1.

The number of vaccinated and licensed animals increases two and one-half percent annually from the FY 1997/1998 base year level.

See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #3.

SDP 02 – Measure #2.

Animal licensing information is provided to 25% of Sunnyvale residential addresses annually.

Animal Control staff placed an article with licensing and general animal control information in the Spring 2002 Quarterly Report that was sent to all city residents. The article included information about dog owner responsibilities under the Municipal Code and vaccination and licensing requirements. Because the report is mailed to all Sunnyvale residents, Animal Control estimated that 100% of all Sunnyvale residential addresses received licensing and general animal control information. The current method of calculation for the measure makes this measure extremely easy to attain. While this does not necessarily mean that a problem exists with the measure, there might be better ways to calculate the measure.

Finding #1: The calculation method in the SOP is not accurate. It states that different addresses are targeted each year from an existing database of all city residences. There is no such database held by Animal Control. The SOP also states that Community Development provides an annual list with the total number of residential addresses. Animal Control does not contact Community Development to obtain such a list. The method of calculation and the data source listed in the SOP are not used to calculate the measure.

Finding #2: The measure can be exceeded with minimal effort and is not a very strong reflection of whether program efforts are successful in educating the general public regarding its role in controlling the animal population. The only thing Animal Control staff has to do to exceed the measure is place an ad in the Quarterly Report that gives brief animal licensing information. The ad gives some licensing information but the information given is limited. Staff assumes that 100% of Sunnyvale residents review the ad.

Finding #3: It appears that efforts at providing general and licensing information duplicate the efforts of other agencies. The Humane Society also focuses its efforts at providing general information and licensing requirements.

Recommendation: In the short-term, the measure should be revised to read as follows: “Animal licensing information is provided to 100% of Sunnyvale residential addresses annually”. In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program’s core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission. For example, the program may wish to focus more on spay and neuter or rabies vaccination efforts instead of providing licensing and general information. The refocus of the core mission should not duplicate efforts of other agencies such as the Humane Society. A specialized and focused mission would save the program time and money that is spent on efforts that are already provided by other agencies. The measure, as it currently stands, is not well linked to program performance.

SDP 02 Measure #3

50% of Sunnyvale schools receive animal control education through department contact annually.

Animal Control staff reported that they contacted 2 out of 26 schools in Sunnyvale. However, Animal Control staff later stated that the number reported was wrong and that it should have been 1 out of 26 schools. Animal Control sends letters to all schools but the measure gauges the number of schools they actually attend. One out of 26 schools results in 3.85% not 7.7%.

Finding #1: The reported result for FY 2001/2002 was incorrect and not properly documented. The source of the calculation was a school participation form from the third grade Kids and Kindness graduation in Braly school. Animal Control staff, however, reported that they contacted 2 out of 26 schools (7.7%.) They later recognized that the number they reported was incorrect and should have been 1 out of 26 schools (3.85%).

Finding #2: The reported result for this measure in FY 2001/2002 is inconsistent with the result reported for Activity 453120 (School Provided with Animal Control Education.) Both of the measures gauge the number of schools provided with education. However, staff used 2 schools out of 26 to compute the result for this measure rather than the one school that was reported in Activity 453120. This measure should be calculated using the same data as Activity 453120.

Finding #3: The measure is extremely difficult to meet. Animal Control sends letters to all the schools in Sunnyvale. The letters encourage schools to allow Animal Control presentations. Many schools, however, do not invite Animal Control to their schools regardless of Animal Control efforts. Part of the reason they do not get invited is because they are competing with several other types of presentations such as fire, Internet, and safety presentations. Moreover, Animal Control does not appear to have the resources to present to half of all the public and private schools in the City of Sunnyvale.

Recommendation: Unless the measure is substantially altered, it will be extremely difficult for Animal Control staff to meet the measure. In the short-term, the measure should be revised so that it focuses on a percentage of only the elementary schools in Sunnyvale. The measure would read as follows: "50% of Sunnyvale elementary schools receive animal control education materials". Animal Control believes their presentations are geared more towards elementary schools. The SOP should also be edited so that it instructs Animal Control staff on how to calculate the measure. Specifically, the SOP should indicate that the measure should be calculated based on the number of schools that distributed animal control education. The measure should also be revised so that the reported number of schools provided with education matches with Activity 453120. In the long-term, staff should explore the option of coordinating joint presentations with the Humane Society so that they are able to present to more elementary schools at a lower cost.

SDP 02 – Measure #4

25% of Sunnyvale residences receive animal control information annually.

See findings and recommendations regarding SDP 02 measure #2. In the short-term, the measure should be revised to read as follows: “100% of Sunnyvale residences receive animal control information annually”. In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program’s core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission.

SDP 02 – Measure #5

Community education related to animal control is provided at two annual City events.

Providing community education involves setting up booths or being present at a city event and distributing information widely. Animal Control staff gathered all the “Animal Control Speaker Request” forms for FY 2001/2002. The forms show that Animal Control was present at the National Night Out and Pancake Breakfast city events. Animal Control therefore reported 2 events for this measure. The result reported for the measure was correct.

Finding #1: The reported result for FY 2001/2002 is inconsistent with Activity 453150 (Education Event Completed.) This measure should report the same result as Activity 453150. However, in FY 2001/2002, the result reported in Activity 453150 (6 events) was incorrect.

Finding #2: The measure does not target specific results of the Animal Control core mission. Community education related to animal control is too broad of a result to gauge. The benefit of such education is not specific enough and does not connect well with achieving the goals outlined under SDP 45302: “Enhance public awareness and safety on animal control issues, decrease animal control calls for service and ensure that the City, State and Federal guidelines are met.”

Recommendation: In the short-term, the measure should be revised so that it targets 4 community education events. The revised measure would read as follows: “Community education related to animal control is provided at 4 events”. In addition to revising the measure, the SOP should also be revised so that the reported total number of specific community education events is consistent with what is reported in Activity 453150. This control mechanism would have ensured that Activity 453150 was reported accurately in FY 2001/2002. In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program’s core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission. For example, specific community education related to spay clinics and/or rabies vaccinations would gauge program performance better than simply providing general information.

SDP 02 – Measure #6

All animal facilities are inspected and permitted as required by law.

See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #6.

Section III: Activity Findings and Recommendations

Activity 453000

An Emergency Call for Service Completed

Police patrol units responded to 73, not 66, vicious animal calls for service that were initially dispatched as vicious. These 73 calls were responded to as “Emergency Calls.” Only 7 of these 73 calls required a report as vicious. Captain Kirk Sanfilippo reviewed all seven cases and none truly fit the definition of a vicious (emergency) call. The reported result was 0.

Finding: The measure cannot be calculated. The existing SOP for this program is incorrectly worded. It states that Animal Control Officers will count one product for each emergency call completed. Emergency calls, however, require a police patrol response since Animal Control Officers only respond to non-emergency calls. Animal control units are not prepared to respond to these types of calls because they are not equipped with lights and sirens. The primary respondents to any animal emergency call are patrol units. Animal Control staff should therefore not report any emergency calls for service.

Recommendation: Eliminate the activity. In the long-term, staff should develop a new measure that is consistent with the program’s core mission and objectives.

Activity 453010

A Non-Emergency Call for Service Completed

Animal Control staff stated that they did not know where the number reported came from. They didn't know if it was from timecards, the CAD System, or a combination of both. As a result, the number reported in FY 2001/2002 (1,636) cannot be substantiated.

Finding: The analysis staff used to arrive at the reported result was not documented. Staff was unable to provide the audit team with information regarding how the 1,636 products were calculated.

Recommendation: Develop a standard methodology for computing the products. The methodology should involve retrieving the total number of certain call types from the CAD system. Staff should manually track calls that come in directly to Animal Control and are not initiated through the CAD system. The number of non-emergency calls should not come from timecards. If Animal Control staff does not have an accurate

number of non-emergency calls for service completed, they should not report any products.

Activity 453020
A Sheltered Animal

This measure did not exist in FY 2001/2002 and was therefore not audited.

Activity 453120
School Provided With Animal Control Education

Animal Control staff reported that they contacted 1 out of 26 schools in Sunnyvale. Animal Control sends letters to all schools but the measure gauges the number of schools they actually attend. The number reported was correct.

Findings: See SDP 02 Measure #3 finding #3.

Recommendation: See recommendation for SDP 02 Measure #3. The product would change to “Elementary school provided with animal control education”.

Activity 453130
Animals Licensed.

According to note 3 of the “Performance Outcomes Agreement Process: Reporting Phase 01/02,” the total number of licensed and vaccinated animals decreased in FY 2001/2002 to 3,925 from a FY 2000/2001 total of 4,046. Animal Control had no sources or evidence to show how the 3,925 or 4,046 numbers were generated. Animal Control Staff ran a query on Crystal Reports and found 3,925 licensed animals at some point in time. If they run a query, they get a different number each time they run the query. They stated that they don't know where the 3,925 came from and that they can no longer generate that number. Animal Control staff was unable to substantiate the 3,925 reported.

Findings: See findings regarding program measure #3.

Recommendation: See recommendations regarding program measure #3. The products reported here should match the result reported in program measure #3.

Activity 453140
Inspections Completed

Findings: The result reported for this activity (3 inspections) was incorrectly reported. See findings regarding program measure #6.

Recommendation: See recommendations regarding program measure #6. The products reported here should match the result reported in program measure #6.

<p style="text-align: center;">Activity 453150 Education Event Completed</p>

Findings: The result reported for this activity (6 events) was incorrectly reported. See findings regarding SDP 45302 Measure #5.

Recommendation: See recommendations regarding SDP 45302 Measure #5. The products reported here should match the result reported in SDP 45302 Measure #5.

Conclusion:

As previously indicated, the lack of documentation does not mean that all the reported results were not in fact achieved, but it exposes the management to questions of credibility that generally could have been averted by taking more care in documenting the program's successes. Better record keeping could have substantiated many of the numbers reported regardless of the outdated SOPs. Many of the reported results had no back-up documentation and the audit team could not substantiate the results reported for several of the measures.

Although better record keeping could solve many of the issues associated with these measures, some of the measures must be reworded, revised, or omitted altogether. Unless substantial revisions are made to the measures themselves, there can be no guarantee that the numbers reported for some of the measures will be accurate. Many of the measures require some rewording and could be easily revised so that the results reported are accurate. A few of the measures, however, are nearly impossible to track or calculate. These measures should be eliminated completely or revised substantially.

A major finding in the Animal Control program is that the measures do not reflect what the program is attempting to accomplish. Part of the reason is that some of the measures are worded incorrectly or are calculated using methods that are no longer reflective of daily operations. Nevertheless, the main reason why many of the measures are not reflective of the program's core mission is that the core mission itself needs revamping. Many of the operational accomplishments of the program are not well defined by the program's mission and objectives. Furthermore, many of the listed objectives are outdated and do not reflect what the program actually accomplishes. For example, the Program Outcome Statement includes "Emergency", "Domestic", and "Non-Domestic" animal control services. However, Animal Control does not respond to all emergency animal control situations and does not distinguish its domestic versus non-domestic services. As a result, the program is full of measures that gauge activities that are not performed by Animal Control staff. The audit team recommends that staff re-examine its program along with its core mission, objectives, and current services and then develop new measures that are closely related. A short-term solution may be to revise the measures so that they are calculable. However, a long-term solution should involve developing new measures that are consistent with the program's core mission and objectives, once the core mission and objectives have been refurbished.



CITY OF SUNNYVALE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
Bureau of Police Field Operations
Animal Control

June 13, 2003

TO: Program Audit Team
FROM: Captain Greg Kevin
RE: Program Audit Results for Animal Control

The Department of Public Safety and the Animal Control Unit wish to thank the Audit Team of Cheryl Waldrip and Pablo Federico for their work on this program audit.

Animal Control (program 453) was the second DPS program audited this year. The audit was conducted with the knowledge that existing program outcome measures, SDPs, and activities are outdated and no longer accurately reflect the program's core mission and objectives. We are pleased that the audit recommends changes that will accurately capture the actual activities conducted by the Animal Control Unit. Additionally, we are pleased that the audit recommends the elimination of certain measures that are no longer of value or that are not calculable. Most of the recommendations repeat and reinforce the statements and concerns that were voiced during the audit process. More importantly, the recommendations contained in the audit demonstrate a need to restructure and redefine the program outcomes, SDPs and activities to accurately reflect Animal Control's changing core mission and objectives.

For the past several years, it has been difficult for Animal Control to accurately report on the existing vague and ambiguous measures. Despite the difficulties involved, Animal Control has attempted to accurately report the results of the defined activities. We look forward to the next stages of the process in which existing measures, SDPs, and activities will be reworked and clarified.

Again, we wish to acknowledge the work, energy and the positive attitude of the audit team. It is our intention to work with the team in defining the new measures, SDPs, and activities, which will serve to guide and evaluate the true program core mission and objectives of the Animal Control Unit.

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Program 453	1. Urgent animal calls are responded to with an average response time of seven minutes (from time received by dispatch).	1. Eliminate the measure.	Agree
Program 453	2. Nuisance animal calls for service are responded to or referred to appropriate agencies within one day 95% of the time.	1. In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure entirely and develop a measure that is closely related to the program's core mission and objectives. A second and short-term alternative is to change the measure to read as follows: "Non-Emergency calls (including nuisance calls) that are dispatched to animal control are responded to within an average of 10 hours." Notice that this alternative would make the measure similar to the recommended measure in SDP 45301 #2.	Agree* Note: In the event of possible budget reductions this measure may have to be revised.
Program 453	3. The number of vaccinated and licensed animals increases two and one-half percent annually from the FY 1997/1998 base year level.	1. In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure and develop a new measure that is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives. In the short-term, the measure may be revised so that it only targets the amount of animal licenses processed. Animal Control staff already tracks it on an accounting period basis on the "Animal Control Unit Statistic Sheet." The measure should read similar to the following: "The number of new and current animal licenses processed remains at or above the previous year level".	Agree
Program 453	4. The Budget/Cost Ratio (planned cost divided by actual cost) is at 1.0.	1. None.	Agree

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Program 453	5. The number of animal control calls for dog bites from stray animals is reduced five percent annually from the base year level.	1. In the long-term, staff should eliminate the measure and develop a new measure that is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives. As a short-term solution, staff can measure the number of bites from stray animals and report that number. The new measure would require a new SOP with a new calculation method and a specific definition of what constitutes a "stray" animal. This type of measure can be manually tracked and is in fact already tracked on an animal bite log sheet. The result reported for this measure should be consistent with the number that is reported to the County of Santa Clara Public Health Department.	Agree* Note: The number reported to County Health includes cats and dogs. A stray animal is an animal with and unknown owner. If the owner is identified, the animal is not stray.
Program 453	6. All animal establishments are inspected and permitted annually to assure that animals are treated humanely and disease prevention measures are in place as required by law.	1. Animal Control staff should devise a reliable way to find the total number of businesses that deal with animals as a primary business function. In doing so, they should remain aware of the parameters established by the SOP as to what constitutes an "inspectable" animal establishment. A possible method of retrieving the total number of animal establishments may be the Business License Tax System from the Finance Department. Staff should determine how to extract the wanted information from the system and include the instructions in the SOP.	Agree
Program 453	7. A satisfaction rating of 85% is achieved for Animal Control Services.	1. Edit the SOP so that it contains an accurate and specific calculation method.	Agree
Service Delivery Plan (SDP) 45301 - Animal Control Response	1. Urgent calls for service for vicious or injured animals affecting Public Safety are responded to with an average response time of seven minutes (from time received by dispatch) achieved.	1. Eliminate the measure. In the long-run, staff should consider if measuring response times to injured animal calls is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives.	Agree

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Service Delivery Plan (SDP) 45301 - Animal Control Response	2. Non-Emergency calls for domestic animal control services are responded to within an average of one day.	1. Revise the measure by eliminating the distinction between domestic and non-domestic. The measure would read as follows: "Non-Emergency calls for animal control services are responded to within an average of 10 hours." This alternate measure can actually be calculated and was developed with the assistance of Animal Control staff. Animal Control staff believes that an average 10 hour response time target is a more realistic goal for measuring Animal Control performance. The measure would require a new SOP with a new calculation method and an explanation describing how to account for after-hours calls.	Agree* Note: In the event of possible budget reductions this measure may have to be revised.
Service Delivery Plan (SDP) 45301 - Animal Control Response	3. Non-Emergency calls for NON-domestic animal control services are responded to within an average of one day.	1. See findings and recommendations regarding SDP 01 Measure #2. This measure would be deleted.	Agree
Service Delivery Plan (SDP) 45301 - Animal Control Response	4. Nuisance non-domestic animal control referrals or services are provided 95% of the time.	1. See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #2. This measure would be deleted.	Agree
Activity 453000 - Provide Emergency Animal Control Services	Product: An Emergency Call for Service Completed	1. Eliminate the activity. In the long-term, staff should develop a new measure that is consistent with the program's core mission and objectives.	Agree

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Activity 453010 - Provide Non-Emergency Animal Control Services	Product: A Non-Emergency Call for Service Completed	1. Develop a standard methodology for computing the products. The methodology should involve retrieving the total number of certain call types from the CAD system. Staff should manually track calls that come in directly to Animal Control and are not initiated through the CAD system. The number of non-emergency calls should not come from timecards. If Animal Control staff does not have an accurate number of non-emergency calls for service completed, they should not report any products.	Agree* Note: All products should be derived from the CAD system. Animal Control Staff should not have to manually track cases. Animal Control shall ensure that all calls are entered into CAD.
Activity 453020 - Animal Shelter	Product: A Sheltered Animal	1. This measure did not exist in FY 2001/2002 and was therefore not audited.	N/A Note: SOP still needs to be developed.
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	1. The number of vaccinated and licensed animals increases two and one-half percent annually from the FY 1997/1998 base year level.	1. See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #3.	Agree
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	2. Animal licensing information is provided to 25% of Sunnysvale residential addresses annually.	1. In the short-term, the measure should be revised to read as follows: "Animal licensing information is provided to 100% of Sunnysvale residential addresses annually". In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program's core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission. For example, the program may wish to focus more on spay and neuter or rabies vaccination efforts instead of providing licensing and general information. The refocus of the core mission should not duplicate efforts of other agencies such as the Humane Society. A specialized and focused mission would save the program time and money that is spent on efforts that are already provided by other agencies. The measure, as it currently stands, is not well linked to program performance.	Disagree Note: 100% may not be a realistic number to meet. If one residence in the city is not contacted, the measure is not met. It would be more appropriate to state, "a majority of residences in the city".

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	3. 50% of Sunnyvale schools receive animal control education through department contact annually.	1. Unless the measure is substantially altered, it will be extremely difficult for Animal Control staff to meet the measure. In the short-term, the measure should be revised so that it focuses on a percentage of only the elementary schools in Sunnyvale. The measure would read as follows: "50% of Sunnyvale elementary schools receive animal control education materials". Animal Control believes their presentations are geared more towards elementary schools. The SOP should also be edited so that it instructs Animal Control staff on how to calculate the measure. Specifically, the SOP should indicate that the measure should be calculated based on the number of schools that distributed animal control education. The measure should also be revised so that the reported number of schools provided with education matches with Activity 453120. In the long-term, staff should explore the option of coordinating joint presentations with the Humane Society so that they are able to present to more elementary schools at a lower cost.	Agree* Note: Staff will also explore other options outside the Humane Society for potential educational opportunities.
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	4. 25% of Sunnyvale residences receive animal control information annually.	1. See findings and recommendations regarding SDP 02 measure #2. In the short-term, the measure should be revised to read as follows: "100% of Sunnyvale residences receive animal control information annually". In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program's core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission.	Disagree Note: 100% may not be a realistic number to meet. If one residence in the city is not contacted, the measure is not met. It would be more appropriate to state, "a majority of residences in the city".

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	5. Community education related to animal control is provided at two annual City events.	1. In the short-term, the measure should be revised so that it targets 4 community education events. The revised measure would read as follows: "Community education related to animal control is provided at 4 events". In addition to revising the measure, the SOP should also be revised so that the reported total number of specific community education events is consistent with what is reported in Activity 453150. This control mechanism would have ensured that Activity 453150 was reported accurately in FY 2001/2002. In the long-term, staff should revitalize the program's core mission and develop a measure that gauges efforts that are tied to the core mission. For example, specific community education related to spay clinics and/or rabies vaccinations would gauge program performance better than simply providing general information.	Agree
Service Delivery Plan 45302 - Animal Control Education and Enforcement	6. All animal facilities are inspected and permitted as required by law.	1. See findings and recommendations regarding program measure #6.	Agree
Activity 453120 - Provide Animal Control Education to Schools	Product: School Provided With Animal Control Education	1. See recommendation for SDP 02 Measure #3. The product would change to "Elementary school provided with animal control education".	Agree
Activity 453130 - Provide Animal Control Licensing Services	Product: Animal Licensed	1. See recommendations regarding program measure #3. The products reported here should match the result reported in program measure #3.	Agree

DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTCOME LEVEL	MEASURE	RECOMMENDATION	DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
Activity 453140 - Conduct Animal Establishment Inspections	Product: Inspection Completed	1. See recommendations regarding program measure #6. The products reported here should match the result reported in program measure #6.	Agree
Activity 453150 - Provide Community Animal Control Education	Product: Education Event Completed	1. See recommendations regarding SDP 45302 Measure #5. The products reported here should match the result reported in SDP 45302 Measure #5.	Agree